



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/272,075	03/18/1999	ANDREAS HENNIGER	GR-98-P-1381	5171

7590 07/02/2003  
LERNER AND GREENBERG  
POST OFFICE BOX 2480  
HOLLYWOOD, FL 330222480

EXAMINER

CHANG, JUNGWON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/272,075

Applicant(s)

HENNIGER ET AL.

Examiner

Jungwon Chang

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.
3. Claims 1, 2 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Echensperger et al. (US 6,199,160 B1).
4. As to claim 1, Echensperger et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed, including a telecommunication system having a remote administration function (col. 6, lines 2-7) comprising:
  - a telecommunications apparatus (2, fig. 2) defining a virtual terminal (4, 5, fig. 2) with properties of a terminal with administration authorization (col. 6, lines 54-62); and
  - a remote computer (T, fig. 2) connected to said telecommunications apparatus (2, fig. 2) , and a data stream to and from said terminal being diverted to said remote computer (col. 5, lines 62-66).
5. As to claim 2, Echensperger et al. further disclose that said terminal with administration authorization is a telephone (col. 6, lines 2-7).
6. As to claim 6, Echensperger et al. disclose said remote computer has a message

Art Unit: 2154

interpreter and an emulator providing an interface and functionality of said terminal with administration authorization (col. 4, lines 51-67).

7. As to claims 7 and 8, Echensperger et al. disclose said telecommunications apparatus has a data interface (API, 6, fig. 3) and control traffic between said virtual port and said telecommunication apparatus is diverted to said data interface (col. 6, lines 44-53).

8. Claims 3-5 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Echensperger et al. (US 6,199,160 B1).

9. As to claims 3-5, Echensperger et al. do not specifically disclose a virtual port. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a virtual port in Echensperger et al's system because doing so would provide a communication port, or a command/status port for accessing status and performance information about the communication device, thereby it could establish a communications connection.

10. As to claims 9-11, Echensperger et al. disclose the telecommunication apparatus has a device handler (5, fig. 2) and virtual terminals (4, fig. 2) inside of the device handler for ports in third OSI layer (col. 1, lines 15-30); and call processing unit has an application interface (API, 6, fig. 2). Echensperger et al. do not specifically disclose UPN

Art Unit: 2154

terminal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include UPN (universal personal number) terminal because virtual terminal is known as a universal terminal so any terminal can talk with any host computer.

11. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al (US 6,185,290 B1).

12. As to claim 1, Shaffer et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed, including a telecommunication system having a remote administration function (col. 2, lines 29-42), comprising:

a telecommunications apparatus (238, 240, 242, fig. 2) defining a terminal with properties of a terminal with administration authorization (col. 14, lines 64-67; col. 15, lines 1-16; col. 27, lines 15-29); and

a remote computer (207, 248, fig. 2) connected to said telecommunications apparatus, and a data stream to and from said terminal being diverted to said remote computer (col. 17, lines 61-67; col. 18, lines 1-9; col. 27, lines 30-48).

13. Shaffer et al. do not specifically disclose terminal is a virtual terminal. However, Shaffer et al. disclose that the terminal (213, 231, fig. 2) is defined as a standard on the network that can handle diverse terminals (col. 27, lines 15-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include

Art Unit: 2154

the virtual terminal to Shaffer et al. because it would provide for any terminal to communicate with any host computer.

14. As to claim 2, Shaffer et al. further disclose that said terminal with administration authorization is a telephone (col. 27, lines 50-61).

15. As to claims 3-5, Shaffer et al. disclose said telecommunication apparatus has a virtual unit and port (col. 34, lines 64-67; col. 35, lines 8-16).

16. As to claim 6, Shaffer et al. disclose said remote computer has a message interpreter and an emulator providing an interface and functionality of said terminal with administration authorization (col. 28, lines 1-5).

17. As to claim 7, Shaffer et al. disclose said telecommunications apparatus has a data interface and control traffic between said virtual port and said telecommunication apparatus is diverted to said data interface (214, fig. 2; col. 29, lines 45-67; col. 30, lines 1-9; col. 34, lines 64-67; col. 35, lines 8-16).

18. As to claim 8, Shaffer et al. disclose said data interface is selected from the group consisting of a V.24 interface, an analog modem and an integrated service digital network card (col. 28, lines 6-13).

Art Unit: 2154

19. As to claims 9-11, Shaffer et al. further disclose said telecommunications apparatus having a call processing unit (fig. 3; col. 15, lines 17-28; col. 27, lines 30-48); said call processing unit has an application interface (col. 8, lines 26-37; col. 11, lines 2-15; col. 24, lines 31-34).

20. Applicant's arguments filed 4/23/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

21. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that

(1) Echensperger and Shaffer do not disclose a word "administration"

(2) Echensperger does not show remote administration of a telecommunications apparatus.

22. Examiner respectfully traverses applicants' remarks.

As to points (1) and (2), the term "administration" is broadly used in independent claim 1 and does not adequately describe the function of administration or performance of administration (i.e. is it intended to mean that remotely administrates data/information stored in the virtual terminal?). Echensperger does not specifically use the term "administration". However, Echensperger discloses that the remote terminal (T, fig. 2) is connected to the virtual terminal (4, fig. 2) via communication link (L\_t1, fig. 2) in order to transmit data streams between the two terminals (i.e. remote administration; col. 7,

Art Unit: 2154

lines 21-38). When tasks are performed including updating, or installing new information remotely from another machine in a network, that is called remote administration.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is (703)305-9669. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703)308-9052. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-7239 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-9669.

Jungwon Chang  
June 27, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. S. Hardy". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long, sweeping tail that extends downwards and to the right.